

HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA

EDELMAN J

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION BY
DJURAN BUNJILEENEE FOR LEAVE TO ISSUE
OR FILE

[2026] HCASJ 30

Date of Judgment: 4 September 2026

M81 of 2026

ORDERS

1. *The application for leave to issue or file a constitutional or other writ filed 13 August 2026 is refused.*
2. *The application for admission of fresh evidence filed 21 August 2026 is refused.*
3. *The application for admission of fresh evidence filed 3 September 2026 is refused.*

Representation

The plaintiff is unrepresented

1 EDELMAN J. By this ex parte application filed on 13 August 2026 under r 6.07.3 of the *High Court Rules 2004* (Cth), the applicant (who is the same applicant as in Matter M80/2026) seeks leave to issue or file another application for a constitutional or other writ which the applicant seeks to have heard before a Full Court of six Justices (excluding Steward J, who gave the direction requiring the applicant to seek leave). Once again, the applicant requires leave to issue or file that proposed application because on 24 July 2026, Steward J directed the Registrar, pursuant to r 6.07.2 of the *High Court Rules*, to refuse to issue or file the application without the leave of a Justice. Once again, the application for leave to issue or file should be refused because the proposed application is both vexatious and an abuse of process.

2 The principal relief sought by the applicant is a writ of prohibition, or alternatively an injunction, directed to the proposed defendant to that application, Senator the Hon Penny Wong, restraining her from "taking any steps to prevent the [applicant] communicating with The Peoples Republic of China" to seek assistance to stop the "ongoing Aboriginal Genocide including the negotiation and signing of a security treaty until the entity calling itself Commonwealth of Australia declares peace and an end to all hostilities against Aboriginal Peoples and the commencement of a truth-telling peace-treaty process as set out in the Plaintiff's application for mandamus against the Honourable Anthony Albanese MP, Prime Minister of Commonwealth of Australia, dated 22 July 2025 and submitted to the Court's Digital Lodgement System ('DLS') the same day".

3 In two further applications, respectively filed on 21 August 2026 and 3 September 2026, the applicant also seeks orders that fresh evidence be admitted, apparently also for consideration in determining the application for leave to issue or file the proposed application in Matter M80/2026.

4 In the proposed application for a constitutional or other writ, the applicant claims to have sent an email to "the ambassador of the People's Republic of China to the Republic of Fiji seeking assistance with forwarding two emails concerning the genocide prosecution of King Charles III to the Grand Council of Chiefs after receiving zero assistance from Commonwealth of Australia officials". The applicant claims to be considering "seeking further assistance from the People's Republic of China to stop the ongoing Aboriginal Genocide ... and the refusal of any high government official to declare [an] end to hostilities and commenc[e] a peace-treaty process".

5 In the applicant's 211-page affidavit (including exhibits) filed on 13 August 2026, other orders are sought including that the proposed application "be listed for hearing on 8 September 2026 with the White Australia case M50/2026" and served on a number of countries including "eighteen member countries of the Pacific Islands Forum". To the extent that the applicant is affected by the issues raised in that case, the applicant, on behalf of "Camp Sovereignty" (which is described in the special case in Matter M50/2026 at [59.13] as an

Indigenous sacred site which was the location of a clash that saw a large number of persons charged with various offences), has been granted leave to intervene by the filing of written submissions.

6 To reiterate what I said of the application for leave to issue or file by the same applicant in Matter M80/2026, the assessment of documents the subject of a r 6.07.2 direction is based upon consideration of the documents on their face which, almost inevitably, takes place on the papers and without an oral hearing.¹ Leave will ordinarily be refused where the proposed application clearly appears on its face to fall outside the jurisdiction of the Court, to be frivolous or vexatious, or to be an abuse of the Court's process, categories which include applications which are confused or manifestly untenable (ie manifestly hopeless).²

7 As with the proposed application in Matter M80/2026, it is again plain on the face of this proposed application and the supporting affidavit (either with or without the two applications for admission of fresh evidence and their supporting affidavits) that the applicant seeks to invoke this Court's original jurisdiction on a basis that is both confused and manifestly hopeless. Like the proposed application in Matter M80/2026, this proposed application is vexatious and an abuse of process. Leave to issue or file this proposed application for a constitutional or other writ is refused. The applications for admission of fresh evidence, which do not assist this application or the application in Matter M80/2026 because they only add further confusion to the proposed application in each matter, should also be refused. Orders should be made consistently with r 13.04 of the *High Court Rules*.

1 *Re Young* (2020) 94 ALJR 448 at 451 [12]; 376 ALR 567 at 570.

2 *Re Young* (2020) 94 ALJR 448 at 451 [11], [13]; 376 ALR 567 at 570; *Citta Hobart Pty Ltd v Cawthorn* (2022) 276 CLR 216 at 246-247 [73].